the last one that was made, is that there would not be and there wasn't intended for there to be any jury trials either in the Supreme Court or in a Circuit Court of Appeals and that Congress has provided no procedure and no method for holding jury trials in either of these two courts. I would like to suggest to this Court if it is to be held there should be a jury trial in a case tried by the Circuit Court of Appeals, then it should be held there must be a jury trial on any criminal contempt proceeding had in a case that involved a contempt of an order of the United States Supreme Court. There is no way to draw a distinction.

I thank the Court.

CHIEF JUDGE TUTTLE: We would normally take a short recess, if we are going to be much longer detained, Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: No, sir, I don't intend to be at all.
Maybe three minutes.

CHIEF JUDGE TUTTLE: Let me inquire whether any party feels that further argument should be made on the points sought to be covered by the Mississippi briefs. If you do nothing more than rebut what has been said, --

MR. CLARK: We have filed the last brief. Does the Court want to know --

CHIEP JUGE TUTTLE: No, no, no. In relation to Mr. Green's brief, is there any request for further oral argument beyond what you are going to say now?

MR. CLARK: No, sir, Your Honor. I do hope the Court will consider the brief Mr. Green submitted.

CHIEF JUDGE TUTTLE: We have said we would do that.

MR. CLARK: -- as amicus, and that is the only request that we made. And, if the Court would permit us to, we have been served with a brief by the Government and they with one by us. I got the Government's brief this morning, and they got mine this morning, although it was sent to Jackson yesterday. There might be a possibility that the Court could be served better by having us respond, but there again that is a matter for the Court to determine. We would, of course, be willing to undertake to answer or respond to their brief if the Court desired it.

think the Court will not delay considering the case awaiting any further briefing, but the Court may not resolve the case within a reasonable time during which you may actually file additional briefs. Therefore, you may, if you see fit, respond to any briefs that have already been filed, in typewritten form as you have heretofore, and if we have not concluded our study of the case and announced our decision on it, we will give every consideration to any additional briefs that are filed.

MR. CLARK: I thank Your Honor. I will be extremely brief.

§ - **5**

10

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Responding principally to Judge Bell's questions 2 with Mr. Jaworski, the Government, the United States Government, is now in the Supreme Court of the United States complaining because of the fact that they are not a respondent to the petition for certiorari. We styled that petition as Meredith vs. Fair and indicated that the United States was amicus curiae in the cause, and we made Meredith the respondent and served copies on his counsel in accordance with the United States Supreme Court Rules and mailed information copies to the Department of Justice, and the Solicitor General of the United States has now filed a 12 motion, which we have opposed, in the Supreme Court of the United States, saying no, that is not it at all, we are the respondents in this case, we have got the moving cause here, and Meredith, the attorneys for Meredith, have filed a statement by telegram with the Court that they don't even care to be heard on the matter now pending on certiorari, and yet the Government wants to come in and take over the lawsuit in the Supreme Court. I don't think there is any question but what the Government is trying to become a party in the Meredith litigation, and I don't think there is any question but what they cannot do so and principally because of the fact that this Court sustained their right to come in and as amicus file pleadings and pursue remedies in the Meredith lawsuit, and it was for one purpose and one

purpose only, and on one ground and on one ground only, and that was on the basis that they were going to do something ancillary to Mcredith.

JUDGE BROWN: That doesn't solve it for me. Assume that they have no standing other than as an adjunct to Meredith. The statute still accords the jury trial only to violations of orders of the District Court. Now how do you get this to be a District Court?

MR. CLARK: Judge, I would say this:as far as the statute is concerned, the only way -- the only contention that we make to Your Honors is that the statute relates not only to District Courts but to the courts of the District of Columbia, which includes Courts of Appeal, but I simply point out to Your Honors that on Judge Bell's theory that if this had been a District Court case, it would have been a proper case for determination and resolution by a Jury, frankly, I think it is more important for a jury to be had here because of the lack of the right of review, regardless of what constitutional right --

JUDGE BROWN: Now we are not construing -- it is pretty difficult to construe a statute that says "District Court" to mean "Court of Appeals." You have to have a pretty powerful basis for that, and what is the basis?

MR. CLARK: The basis that I can come to you on myself when you get to this statute and say that "District

Court" can't encompass "Courts of Appeal" and reject the argument because it is accorded to Courts of Appeal of the District of Columbia and these people are not entitled to equal rights and immunities, I think you still come to the last section --

CHIEF JUDGE TUTTLE: We will take a short recess.

(Whereupon, at the request of the reporter, a brief recess was granted by the Court.)

AFTER THE RECEST:

CHIEF JUDGE TUTTLE: I may say there is one thing about the Supreme Court that I think is excellent, that is, that all the Justices have their own doors. They can all come in at the same time. (LAUGHTER)

MR. CLARK: May it please the Court, unless the Court feels otherwise, I would really like to conclude. I have only this point to make in addition:

Judge Brown asked me before the recess why only
District Courts were mentioned in these statutes, and
considering further of it, as far as I would answer, I would
say that I don't believe Congress ever conceived that we
would be standing here today in a Court of Appeals trying
a criminal contempt case, and I think Congress certainly
intended for you to have contempt powers, civil contempt
powers, that were necessary, to go as far as the power

needed to go to get your orders enforced, the least possible power to achieve the end desired, but I just don't believe that anybody in Congress ever conceived that today, for the first time in the history of the jurisprudence of the United States of America, we would be standing in a Court of Appeals on a criminal contempt matter.

.

And the Court was kind enough to give me a bouquet I want to say that I consider it a privilege to practice before the Fifth Circuit. I recall a number of decisions that I didn't participate in, and yet I know the Court is proud of, Lumbermen's Mutual vs. Elbert, Cox vs. Roth, decisions of that type where this Circuit has been a pioneer, where this Circuit == and I don't mean to say == I am not trying to butter you up, because this Court doesn't belong to you, and someday I won't be here and you won't be here, but I believe that the Fifth Circuit will be here, and I talk just as much of the Court of Judge Holmes as I do of your Court, and Borah and Russell and McCord and the rest who have made the Fifth Circuit great through the years.

I know that this Court is going to give us careful and most mature consideration on the questions presented in the appeal. We have tried not to be frivilous, and I hope the Court hasn't -- although we have urged some propositions that some of you consider new or novel, I think this question

involves more than the litigants in this lawsuit. I think it has the most delicate elements of state and national relationships in it.

I appreciate the very lengthy time that you have indulged us, and the other attorneys on behalf of the Defendants join with me in thanking the Court for its attention.

CHIEF JUDGE TUTTLE: Is there anything else that needs to be said on behalf of either the Government or the Respondents? (NO RESPONSE)

Well, it will be fairly obvious that a number of legal questions have now been submitted to the Court. As we have attempted to do in other phases of this and associated cases, we will attempt to resolve these issues as soon as we possibly can. The Court cannot indicate when that will be, but, there being no further matters to come before the Court at this time, the Court will now stand adjourned until further order of the Court.

....Thereupon, the matter was submitted....

CERTIFICATE

I, Helen R. Dietrich, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing (Pages 1-203 of typewritten matter) is a true and correct transcription of the stenographic (Stenotype) notes of the proceedings herein, taken down by me, and by me transcribed, at the time and place herein-before noted, in the above-entitled and numbered cause now pending before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States.

Helen & Distant

12

10

11.

14

16

17

19

20

22

21

24

25

23

Reporter's Note: In further extension of an earlier note appearing in this record in connection with the oral argument by Mr. Montgomery, voluminous quotations, citations, etc. were not made available to the reporter, and were transcribed from the notes as they lay with frequent insertion of a point of interrogation. Readers of the record are respectfully referred to the source material.

May it be further understood that "Rule 42-b" as appearing in this record is correctly written "Rule 42 (b)."

H.R.D.